

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:
 WATKIN Timothy Lawrence
 Lloyd Wise
 Tanjong Pagar P O Box 636
 Singapore 910816

LLOYD	WISE
07 JUN 2005	
RECEIVED	

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	31 May 2005 (31.05.2005)
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference FP2558	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/SG 2005/000085	International filing date (day/month/year) 17 March 2005 (17.03.2005)	Priority Date (day/month/year) 24 March 2004 (24.03.2004)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B66C 1/66		
Applicant NSL ENGINEERING PTE LTD		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Cont. No. I Basis of the opinion
- Cont. No. II Priority
- Cont. No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Cont. No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Cont. No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Cont. No. VI Certain documents cited
- Cont. No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Cont. No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ AT Austrian Patent Office Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna	Authorized officer
Facsimile No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 535	NIMMERRICHTER R.

Authorized officer	NIMMERRICHTER R.
Telephone No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 314	

Continuation No. I

Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed.

Continuation No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 6-13	YES
	Claims 1-5	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 6-13	YES
	Claims 1-5	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-13	YES
	Claims ----	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The first document cited in the search report, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses a spreader assembly with a linking frame for the interlinkage of headblock units of two spreaders. In further accordance with the application, the linking frame comprises a configuration mechanism which, while the linking frame is connected to both the spreader units, is operative to move the spreader units relative to each other. The configuration mechanism includes one or more hydraulic cylinders.

However a comparison of the solution of this known device in the state of the art document with the present application shows that all essential features of the claims 1 to 5 can be found in this document. Therefore the subject-matter of these claims is neither new nor incorporates an inventive step.

Neither a releasable connection for the linking frame to the spreaders via the headblock units nor a docking station for lockable the linking frame to the trolley of the crane are provided. Therefore all other in particular not mentioned claims are new with respect to the cited documents. The subject-matters of these claims are considered to involve an inventive step too, because the solutions as disclosed in prior art documents do not lead a man skilled in the art to the result as given in the present application.

The applicant is requested to file new claims which take account of the above comments. The new claims should satisfy the criteria set forth in article 33 (1)-(3) PCT taking account of rule 6.3(b) PCT. The applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference vis-à-vis the state of the art and the significance thereof.

Industrial applicability of all the subject-matters exists obviously.

Continuation No. VIII:

Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Reference signs in parentheses should be inserted in the claims to increase their intelligibility (Rule 6.2b PCT).
